



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,874	08/20/2003	Kenneth F. Buechler	071949-7002	8658
30542	7590	06/21/2006	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP P.O. BOX 80278 SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278			LUM, LEON YUN BON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/645,874	Applicant(s) BUECHLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Leon Y. Lum	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-28 and 35-42, drawn to a method for detecting the presence or amount of one or more biologically active natriuretic peptides, classified in class 436, subclass 501.
 - II. Claims 29-33, drawn to a method of inhibiting degradation of a natriuretic peptide, classified in class 424, subclass 9.2.
 - III. Claim 34, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising one or more inhibitors of prolyl-specific DPP and one or more additional molecules, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are directed to related natriuretic peptides. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the

Art Unit: 1641

instant case, the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, are not obvious variants, and have a materially different mode of operation, function, and effect.

Group I is a method with the function and effect of assaying a sample *in vitro* to determine the presence of a specific natriuretic peptide, which is different from the function and effect of Group II. Group II is a method with the purpose of treating a subject *in vivo* by administering a specific inhibitor. Because the function and effect of the two groups are different, the modes of operation are also different. In Group I, the assaying method is performed using a specific binding partner coupled with a detection step and specific signal reduction requirements, which are not required limitations in Group II. In Group II, the administering method requires the step of supplying a subject with an inhibitor, which is not a required limitation of Group I. Furthermore, since Group I is directed towards an assaying method in an *in vitro* environment and Group II is directed towards a treating method *in vivo*, the two groups are not obvious variants and there is no overlap in scope.

3. Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are not capable of use together and have different designs, modes of operation, and effects.

Group I is an assaying method for detecting the presence of natriuretic peptides in a sample, which is a completely different design and effect from the pharmaceutical

Art Unit: 1641

compound of Group II. The pharmaceutical compound has the effect of inhibiting natriuretic peptides, but is not claimed as applied in the scope of an *in vitro* assaying test. Rather, the pharmaceutical compound is administered to a subject, which is a completely different mode of operation than the assay of Group I. Because of the difference in scope, the two groups are not capable of use together.

4. Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in the materially difference process of analyte detection in a competitive immunoassay test.

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In addition, because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Group I is directed towards *in vitro* assays, which requires searching in databases and references that would not necessarily include information on the *in vivo* environment required by Group II or the

Art Unit: 1641

composition of the pharmaceutical compound in Group III. Group II is directed towards an administration of prolyl-specific DPP, which may not necessarily include the multi-component pharmaceutical compound of Group III. In addition, references that teach the composition of Group III may only disclose the process of making the composition and will not necessarily disclose a specific process of using that composition *in vivo*.

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species: BNP and ANP (Group I only).

In the event that Group I is elected, an election between the two species below is required:

1. BNP, claims 3, 12, 19, 36, and 39.
2. ANP, claims 4, 13, 20, 37, and 40.

The species are independent or distinct because BNP and ANP are structurally different peptides comprising different amino acid sequences.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, for Group I, claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-18, 21-28, 35, 38, and 41-42 are generic. Claims 3-4, 12-13, 19-20, 36-37, and 39-40 are subject to species election.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims

Art Unit: 1641

readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Art Unit: 1641

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Y. Lum whose telephone number is (571) 272-2878. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571) 272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 1641

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leon Y. Lum
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641



LYL



LONG V. LE 06/14/06
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600